UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,182	11/03/2000	Theron Tock	DANAP002	5563

44987 7590 05/26/2005

HARRITY & SNYDER, LLP
11240 WAPLES MILL ROAD
SUITE 300
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER	
ENG, DAVID Y	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/706,182	TOCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID Y. ENG	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/28/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim 9 has been cancelled. Claim 47 has been added. The active claims are 1-8 and 10-47.

Claims 1-8, 10-30, 38 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not seen how the last step of claim 1 is related to forming a modified request to direct to a second server.

In claim 24, it appears that the original link as modified is unable to facilitate access to other resources residing on remote servers because the modified link is not linking to the remote server in where the resource is resided. Further, forwarding the markup language document as modified (link modification) to a requestor does not facilitate any access to other resources resided on remote servers. Still further, it is not clear what the requester is requesting.

Claim 26 has similar defects set forth above.

The last two steps of claim 27 are not understood. The steps do not result to requests associated with the URL are directed to the intermediary server rather than the resource.

Scope of claim 38 is not clear in that it is not clear what the modified target URL is for. It does not appear that the target URL is modified by merely appending the hostname of a source URL to the target URL.

Scope of 46 is not clear in that it is not seen how the markup language document modified in a manner as set forth in the steps is able to facilitate access to other markup language document.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-8 and 10-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber (USP 5,812,769).

Details of the rejection have been set forth in the last Office action. The details are incorporated herein by reference thereto.

With respect to the remarks on pages 16-19 of the response submitted on 3/23/2005, note that the steps (3^{rd}-5^{th}) broadly recite retrieving a replacement hostname portion from a storage and substituting the initial hostname portion with the replacement hostname such that the request could be redirect to another server. Those steps are essential or inherent steps in redirecting a request to another server. For example, if a person receives a mail from the postman and the person wants to forward the mail to another address because the recipient moved to another address. The person would retrieve the new address from a drawer associated with the person and replace the old address with a new address so that the mail could be delivered to the new address. It is notorious trivial even without the teaching of Graber. Certainly Graber teaches the broad concept recited in the claims. See page 3 of the Office action. The abstract of Graber points out the redirection is done by replacing URL addresses. If it is the requester who wants to redirect to a different destination, obviously the replacement

URL would be provided by him as in the case of Graber. Otherwise, the replacement would be provided by the redirector if the redirector wants to alter the destination as in the instant invention. No inventive concept or unexpected result is seen from the claims. Further, Applicants fail to provide any arguments as to why the steps are patentable distinct from Graber. See 37CFR1.111c.

With respect to claims 15 and 17, the redirector obviously would not replace the URL arbitrarily. There must be some reason found in the request trigger the redirector to redirect the request. If it is found that it is the port within the request which requires redirect, obviously the replacement can be located or retrieved in accordance with the port because there must be some association between the port and the replacement.

As to claims 24 and 39, it appears that Applicants want the Examiner to find their claims rather their invention in Graber. The scope of claims 24 and 39are no different from claim 1, only the labels of the addresses (link instead of URL, first/second server instead of remote/intermediate serve etc.) and servers are different.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to DAVID Y. ENG at telephone number 571-272-3984.

DAVID Y. ENG
PRIMARY EXAMINER